United Nations S/PV.3690

Security Council

Fifty-first Year

Provisional

3690th Meeting

Friday, 16 August 1996, 4.30 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Eitel	(Germany)
Members:	Botswana	Mr. Nkgowe
	Chile	Mr. Espinosa
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Egypt	Mr. Elaraby
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	Guinea-Bissau	Mr. Lopes Cabral
	Honduras	Mr. Martínez Blanco
	Indonesia	Mr. Wisnumurti
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Poland	Mr. Matuszewski
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Park
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John Weston
	United States of America	Mr. Gnehm

Agenda

Letter dated 9 January 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the extradition of the suspects wanted in the assassination attempt on the life of the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 26 June 1995 (S/1996/10)

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) (S/1996/541 and Add.1, 2 and 3)

96-86110 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 9 January 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the extradition of the suspects wanted in the assassination attempt on the life of the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 26 June 1995 (S/1996/10)

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1054 (1996) (S/1996/541 and Add.1, 2 and 3)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Sudan in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Erwa (Sudan) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1054 (1996), documents S/1996 541 and Addenda 1, 2 and 3.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1996/664, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Botswana, Egypt and Guinea-Bissau.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: S/1996/402, S/1996/464 and S/1996/513, which contain letters dated 31 May, 24 June and 2 July 1996, respectively, from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; and S/1996/538, letter dated 10 July 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The first speaker on my list is the representative of the Sudan, on whom I now call.

Mr. Erwa (Sudan) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: Allow me to begin by offering heartfelt congratulations, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We have confidence in your wisdom and in your ability to lead the deliberations of the Council to positive and just results. We would also like to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Dejammet, the Permanent Representative of France, for the wisdom with which he conducted the deliberations of the Council last month.

Sudan's firm condemnation of terrorism has been expressed in all international forums, including in the United Nations and in the Security Council. Our condemnation stems from our firm principle of refraining from violence and following a path of peace and security.

I should like to reiterate my country's position for all who would like to open their hearts, to understand and to listen. The Sudanese Government and people forcefully condemn terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, irrespective of the reasons or motivations of those responsible.

Sudan has not, and will not, allow its territory to be used for any act of terror or to be used as a shelter for terrorists or by those who have eluded justice. Sudan, like many other States, suffers day after day with those innocent civilians who lose their lives or who are harmed as a result of terrorist acts perpetrated in many parts of the world. Killing women and children, terrorizing peaceful citizens, destroying property and taking innocent civilians hostage cannot be accepted under any divine law; nor can they be accepted by any human being who believes in justice and peace.

My delegation reiterates its firm positions of principle, which have been repeated time and again and have not been heeded. We hope that this time the Council will listen and understand the seriousness and sincerity of our position.

Sudan renews its strong condemnation of the tragic terrorist attempt on the life of the Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak and firmly believes that those who participated in this terrorist crime must be brought to justice and punished. Sudan expressed its full readiness to cooperate with all parties to bring the suspects to justice, and took tangible steps in this respect even before the subject was brought before the Central Organ of the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which discussed the question before it was brought to the Security Council.

Sudan sent a special presidential envoy to Ethiopia to communicate the results arrived at by the commission of inquiry established by the President of the Republic on the basis of the information provided by Ethiopia about the Egyptian suspects a month after the incident took place. But I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that at that time Sudan gave Ethiopia the landing card received by one of the suspects upon landing at Khartoum airport immediately after the incident. Our dealings with Ethiopia were completely open. We wanted to cooperate in the search for and apprehension of the suspects. It is strange that that very same card was presented by our neighbour, Ethiopia, as proof of Sudan's involvement.

From the very beginning, Sudan approached the issue with good intentions and in a spirit of cooperation and confidence in our integrity and innocence.

I speak in full knowledge of the arrangements that were undertaken. The relevant authorities investigated this suspect who had entered Sudan, and they failed to find any trace of him there. We tried to trace him and find him, even before the adoption of resolution 1044 (1996), and we continue to do so. It has been proved beyond any doubt that the period that elapsed between his entry into Sudan and our receipt of the information from Ethiopia, when we started the search, provided him with the opportunity to flee the country.

According to the information provided by Ethiopia, he carries passports from many States, including Ethiopia, the country making the complaint, and Egypt, of which he is a national. It is well known that Sudan is a vast country with many points on its borders that cannot be controlled. But here I would like to mention in particular the fact that we continue to carry out our investigations into the route he took when he fled. Sudan is fully committed to providing any information it can in that respect.

This is the stage we have reached in trying to trace one of the suspects whom Sudan was asked to extradite under resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996). All members of the Council are aware of the press reports published about the other suspect, Mustafa Hamza. They also know about his interviews with reporters from his hiding place, which was outside the control of the Government of Afghanistan. Sudan drew the Council's attention to this fact before the adoption of resolution 1054 (1996). Sudan tried at the time to verify the information included in these reports by requesting the Council to establish an investigative committee to verify the information provided. When Sudan did not receive a positive response to the request, it tried unilaterally to verify the information and then intensified its contacts with the Afghan Government. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan confirmed the presence of the suspect inside Afghanistan, in an area outside the control of the Afghan Government.

We concur with the members of the Council who said that press reports cannot be considered hard evidence of the presence of the suspect in Afghan territory. However, the letter from the Afghan Foreign Minister confirming the press reports is before the Council today in document S/1996/513. Furthermore, many members of the Council have already verified the information and know that the suspects are not in Sudan.

What is asked of Sudan now? How can you give what you do not have? To request Sudan to extradite suspects it does not have is like asking it to try to square the circle, and is unjustified — unless the objective is to find an excuse to impose unjust sanctions.

Security Council resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996) refer to three suspects. The issue of the third suspect still raises many questions. What information about him is available in Sudan, Ethiopia or Egypt? His name is Izat or Yasim. There is no photograph of him. However, it is known that he is an Egyptian national, 34 years old, is married and lives in the Amarat quarter of Khartoum. That is the information that is available — it is the only information about him that Ethiopia has provided.

At the beginning, Sudan tried to verify the information provided about the character of the suspect, and the investigative commission tried to search the quarter where Ethiopia claimed he lived. However, we could find no trace of him and concluded that this person does not exist, but is merely a fictitious character,

unknown to us or to any of the other parties concerned with the matter.

I would like to refer to a comment that attracted our attention in a letter of 25 July 1995 from the President of Ethiopia, delivered to Sudan. This document claimed to include all the information about the suspects. Its annex 2 says of this fictitious suspect:

(*spoke in English*)

> "His full identity can be obtained from Mustafa Hamza and from Husayn Ahmed Shair'Ali".

(*spoke in Arabic*)

This sentence persuaded me to re-examine the press interview with Mustafa Hamza, and compare it with the comments in the Ethiopian letter. I found out that he stated that two, not three, people had participated in the assassination attempt in Addis Ababa and were able to leave the country. That confirmed our belief that this suspect did not exist. Some might say that we cannot depend on press releases by the suspect; that may be true. What is clear is that the information presented about the so-called third suspect is insufficient and unprofessional. No security or police force, regardless of how qualified, could trace a suspect on the basis of that information. Is Sudan required to chase mirages? That is my question.

Despite my comments about the suspects, and the fact that we made sure that they were not present in Sudan, we seriously and earnestly tried to trace them and obtain any additional information about them. In particular, we fully understand our responsibility towards the Sudanese people, who have been subjected to sanctions because of the extremely difficult demand made of Sudan to extradite the suspects for prosecution. Sudan spared no effort, employing all its technical and professional capability. It requested the assistance of Interpol in trying to locate the suspects and the participation of a security team from Ethiopia and Egypt in searching for the suspects. We got no answer. I admit that we have so far failed to find the suspects. This confirms our belief that they are not in Sudan.

Sudan shares the Council's view about the need to punish those who attempted to assassinate the Egyptian President. Sudan is committed to extraditing them if they are in its territory. It is also committed to cooperating with the Member States concerned, the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations in this respect. We hope that this cooperative spirit will be reciprocated.

Sudan is also committed to turning over all available information, now and in the future, stemming from the ongoing investigations. However, Sudan cannot accept responsibility for the disappearance of the suspects or the failure to find them, especially since we are certain they are not in Sudan. Those who claim they are in Sudan must provide us with the information that will lead us to them.

The rationale for holding Sudan responsible for the presence of those people on its territory during a certain time period because they used Sudan as a transit point, or even because they resided in Sudan, can also be used to make each State through which they have passed or in which they have resided during different periods responsible at those times. In this sense, Ethiopia, where the crime took place and where the suspects remained for a considerable period of time, entering and leaving Ethiopia over a two-year period, as mentioned in the Ethiopian document, can be considered directly responsible. Why did Ethiopia not discover them at the time of their entries and departures? It is unacceptable to fail to provide adequate information that would help us find the suspects. Nor is it acceptable to use the pretext of protecting classified and delicate sources, because these sources are usually made available precisely at the critical moment when they are needed, and not afterwards. I really do not believe that punishing and depriving people should be so easy or that protecting sources and witnesses should be more important than human lives.

I do not wish to take up much of your time. However, the entire people of Sudan is being subjected to sanctions, and the embargo is a result of unfounded accusations from secret sources that cannot be revealed.

Here I would like to raise some questions. Why were those suspects brought to justice in secrecy? Why were Egyptian lawyers not permitted to see them? Why was Mr. Garekhan not able to meet them? Why were the Ambassadors of the permanent members of the Security Council not able to meet them? Why did the court proceedings stop? It is ridiculous. It is astounding that some parties would depend on information provided in a press conference with those suspects, who are protected by law. However, they could not be brought to a court where they could say what they wanted to say.

Security Council resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996) call on Sudan to desist from supporting terrorism and terrorists and from providing them with shelter. Thus was a grave accusation levelled against Sudan and used as a pretext to punish it, despite the fact that no one has given any firm evidence of actual occurrences. However, Sudan took the matter seriously and with great interest and it discussed the pretext that prompted this accusation. Sudan is a country known throughout history for having avoided any path that might lead to violence or terror and a country that has always advocated peace and love.

The Sudanese Government seriously sought to enter into contacts with the countries that levelled these accusations because we in Sudan understand the reasons that led some States to do so. We took immediate actions after our dialogue and contacts and undertook specific security measures, in accordance with their advice. We expelled from Sudan all foreigners that aroused these States' concerns, especially those called the Arab Afghans, whether or not they had engaged in hostile activities.

Some might ask why these people are in Sudan, and this is a legitimate question. Here I would like to clarify a very important fact. The presence of many Arabs and Africans in Sudan is a result of the policy adopted by the Sudanese Government six years ago. We do not require an entry visa for some Arabs and some nationals of African States. We in Sudan would like to encourage interaction with our Arab and African brothers and to encourage investment in our country. Such a policy is followed by many States, including States of the European Union. This policy was not invented by Sudan. It is a well-known practice in the international community. As a result of this policy, many nationals of Arab and African States have entered Sudan, and with an increase in their numbers and in the absence of any record of their presence, because they have never applied for entry visas, some States started expressing concern with regard to some individuals or groups.

The first reaction by the Government of Sudan, following the attempt on the life of the Egyptian President and the accusations levelled by certain Egyptians residing in Sudan, was to reintroduce the visa system. We were then able to create a record of all foreigners residing in Sudan.

Pursuant to Security Council resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996), Sudan requested all foreigners to leave the country. Here I would like to clarify a very important point. Sudan did not receive accusations from any State against any of those expelled from Sudan. None of those expelled is anyone who should be brought to justice in this or any other country. All foreigners were expelled as a result of a decision taken by Sudan because we wish to be outside the circle of suspicion and to comply with the Security Council resolutions. We also wish to spare our people any suffering and to be fully dedicated to our economic development, in cooperation with friendly and brotherly countries.

Holding Sudan solely responsible for all terrorist acts that occur in neighbouring countries, in our region and in the entire world will not solve the problem of international terrorism. The solution to this disaster facing humanity today lies in trying to tackle the real causes of the problem and then in addressing them, one after the other. Making unfounded accusations against States — simply condemning them under the pretext of fighting terrorism — is not a solution to the problem.

I would like to mention that Sudan shares with the Security Council members and the international community the desire to fight terrorism and wishes to express its sincere willingness to cooperate with any State to reach this objective. The victims of terrorism are our brothers, our fathers, our mothers and our children.

I want to reiterate that the steps taken by Sudan were not a diversionary tactic, as some sought to make them appear. They were genuine measures that yielded tangible, well known results. They have become the policy of the Sudanese Government, and these security measures can be verified, because Sudan is open to anyone who wishes to investigate and confirm the situation.

In its two earlier resolutions, the Security Council called upon Sudan to improve its relations with its neighbours. I shall not discuss the details of those resolutions or the circumstances of their adoption; I shall merely say that Sudan has 10 neighbour States, and has extremely good, friendly relations with six of them, to which we are committed through various agreements and joint ministerial committees that meet regularly.

What are the facts about our relations with the other four States? Let us begin with Ethiopia, the country which submitted the original complaint. Relations between Sudan and Ethiopia had been very good, and were gradually developing, apart from a few border problems that were resolved through understandings reached between the parties. Relations continued to be

friendly even after the tragic attempt on the life of the President of Egypt. Owing to its gravity, that incident caused a misunderstanding between the two countries, which will come to an end as soon as the problem is resolved. That is why Sudan has been eager to continue its contacts with Ethiopia to try to settle the problem and move forward. Our efforts culminated in a meeting between the Presidents of Ethiopia and of Sudan at the African summit held at Yaounde, at which they discussed matters of interest to both countries. They both reaffirmed their intention to cooperate to prevent relations from deteriorating. We see this as a first step, and want to reiterate our determination to continue on this path. We are confident that our neighbour Ethiopia shares that determination.

Our second neighbour is Uganda, with regard to which we inevitably harbour some resentment. It is very well known that Uganda has supported the insurgency movement in southern Sudan. From the start of that movement in 1984, it has provided financial and moral support to the insurgents, enabling them to attack Sudan from Ugandan territory. That support has continued since the current Government came to power. Sudan has constantly sought a rapprochement between our two countries. Even when our efforts seemed to yield success, this was only temporary, for Uganda would soon return to its customary practices. Sudan has tried to improve its relations with Uganda, and has undertaken initiatives with respect to third-State mediation: Malawi and, earlier, Libya and Austria have engaged in mediation efforts. But whenever a date was set for a meeting between officials of our two countries, Uganda would fail to appear and make excuses to avoid the meeting. Ugandan troops have tried to support the insurgency by entering Sudanese territory, but these Ugandan attempts have been doomed to failure. Sudan has always hoped that a solution to the situation could be found on a bilateral basis, and that Uganda would respond to one of the mediation efforts. We have hoped too that the situation could be resolved in an African context. That is why we have never brought the Ugandan aggression before the Security Council and have not spoken of the Ugandan invasion.

But we now despair of a response by Uganda, especially since Uganda has accused Sudan of supporting Christian fundamentalists within its southern border, even though it knows perfectly well that the border area is not under Government control, but is controlled by the insurgents supported by Uganda itself.

I think that members of the Council are well aware of the many problems between Uganda and all its other neighbours without exception. Some of these have come before the Security Council. Hence, I think that members know which party is attempting to destabilize the region.

Sudan continues to try to pursue the mediation efforts to which I referred earlier. I thank the many States that have undertaken endeavours in that connection, and today I urge them to continue to try to convince Uganda to accept negotiations and consultations to settle all disputes between our two countries. I reiterate that Sudan is serious, and is ready to sit down at the negotiating table with its neighbour to the South, Uganda, with a view to normalizing relations.

I turn next to Eritrea. Eritrea is a poison dagger; it is truly a wound festering on our eastern borders; it poses dangers that threaten to spread throughout the Horn of Africa.

Eritrea is the only State in the world whose President declares, in public and before the international mass media, that it will provide armed assistance to any opposition groups aiming to topple the legitimate Government of Sudan. Speaking about this support, he said to the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)

(spoke in English)

"I would say the sky is the limit."

(spoke in Arabic)

Yes, that is what the Eritrean President himself said to the BBC. I leave it to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of this Council, to assess this statement by the Eritrean President.

In addition, there were intrusions into Sudanese territory and the laying of mines inside residential areas, which killed many Sudanese citizens. This prompted Sudan to draw the attention of the Council to such practices. Here we can refer to Security Council documents S/1995/569, S/1995/522, S/1994/133 and S/1994/71.

While some try to blame the Sudanese side, let us look at Eritrean relations with its neighbours. Those relations were the subject of daily editorials in the international press. Even yesterday there were reports of attacks and military hostilities, and the Council and

international courts were made aware of it. The efforts made by some members of the Council for Eritrea to improve its relations and settle its disputes with some of its neighbours are known to everyone.

I would simply ask if Eritrea's conduct and its aggressive attitude towards the Sudanese people and its Government — its legitimately elected Government — are Sudan's responsibility. Sudan and the Sudanese people have hosted and shared with the Eritrean people for years, due to the frivolous policies of the Eritrean Government; — will they now be punished? Will they have to suffer the harsh and repeated Eritrean acts of aggression, and then have to bear the blame?

The members of the Council will remember what we said in document S/1996/358 about the Eritrean act of military aggression on Sudanese territory and the opening of the Sudanese embassy in Asmara to the armed Sudanese opposition in a step that had no precedent in international law or in civilized behaviour. Nevertheless, I would like to recall that Sudan did not initiate hostilities against Eritrea. It stands ready to eliminate the tension between the two countries if Eritrea shows its good intentions towards Sudan, and if it desists forthwith from providing outlaws with armed support, from destabilizing Sudan and from terrorizing Sudanese citizens in the eastern part of our country.

Let us turn once more to a country that is our sister and our neighbour, Egypt. We would like to state, as we have done in the past, that the time-honoured relationships between our two peoples and our two countries are very special. This is a relationship that goes far back in history. It is as old as the Giza pyramids near Cairo and the Birawia pyramids in the northern part of Sudan. It is as old as the Nile valley, through which flows our life-giving blood. It is very difficult for people outside Egypt or Sudan to understand the depth and the complexity of this relationship that has always been limited — at its best and at its worst — to the two parties.

Perhaps it was destiny that led us today to this landmark moment in the relationship between our two countries, a moment when the very special nature of our relationship is brought before international and even regional forums. This fills us with bitterness. However, we want to comply with the Security Council's resolutions, which obligate us to discuss our relationship with our sisterly neighbour through the Security Council.

Major efforts were made between the officials of our two countries; they were crowned with success at the summit meeting between President Hosni Mubarak and President Omer Hassan Ahmed Al-Bashir in Cairo. No observer could describe the meeting as anything but a success. Proof of this success is that it was followed by a series of meetings between the two countries' Foreign Ministers, their Ministers of the Interior and their Ministers of Information. It was agreed to establish security committees to solve the security problems between the two countries.

The first meeting of these committees was held on 3 July 1996 in Khartoum. It was a general preliminary meeting devoted to discussing the problems of the two parties with a view to reconvening within a week. Our security delegation in Sudan has been ready for the convening of the second meeting since 10 July 1996. We are still attempting to contact the Egyptian leadership regarding the holding of this meeting.

I would like here to speak with the transparency required in this Council. We heard our Egyptian brothers accuse us of procrastination and a lack of seriousness. I would like to ask how a short preliminary meeting intended to discuss a general framework and procedural matters and to decide upon the details to be discussed can be said to lack seriousness or be an occasion for precrastination? How could our relations have deteriorated to a point where such a judgement could be made?

I would not like to speculate that the real intention was simply to waste precious time so that the matter would be brought to the attention of this Council in order that more pressure would be brought to bear on Sudan.

I would like to confirm here that in our view these steps represented a very good and encouraging beginning, especially if we take into consideration the fact that these meetings were considered the first of their kind between the leaders of the two countries in six years.

That is why it may not be easy to hasten the results and to expect an immediate resolution to all pending questions between the two countries. Arriving at a solution to such questions with sisterly Egypt is one of the first strategic priorities of the Sudanese Government. Sudan is very serious in its approach. Sudan is fully committed to the framework laid down by the Presidents of our two countries to bring about a *rapprochement* and to solve all pending problems between us. The Sudanese

Government has genuine and honest intentions that it would like to translate into tangible joint endeavours in order to improve our relationship.

Ultimately, Sudan would have hoped that sisterly Egypt would not be a force behind attempts to impose sanctions on the Sudanese people, a people that has always had sincere concern for the problems and worries of the Egyptian people. Sudan has always been a natural extension of Egypt, as Egypt has been of Sudan. Allow me to quote a line of Arabic poetry that describes the situation between us and the Egyptian people: the injustice of kinsmen is more painful than the blow of a sword.

These are the efforts that we in Sudan made, in all honesty, in an effort to comply with the Security Council resolutions. Despite the many concerns and objections we voiced at the time, Sudan has been fully committed from day one to the implementation of all the resolutions. Sudan's continued efforts are not made with regard solely for our neighbouring countries, but for all countries of the world, and especially for the major Powers. Our efforts genuinely express our respect for international legitimacy and for the basic principles of peaceful coexistence between countries and peoples.

All we are asking of the international community in general, and from the Security Council in particular, is fairness and justice. We ask that the whole question be viewed objectively in the light of the steps already taken by Sudan. No one can really deny that these steps were taken; Sudan knows that all members of the Council, without exception, admitted that Sudan had taken some positive steps. What was the result? Did the Council encourage Sudan to proceed with these steps by lifting some of the sanctions, or at least give us the chance, to take further positive steps? Or did it warn of further sanctions which, if applied, would have adverse humanitarian and economic effects, not only on Sudan, but on the Horn of Africa region in general?

The draft resolution before the Council today follows the path of the imposition of sanctions. Members of the Security Council and of the United Nations in general are well aware of the destructive results of these sanctions and of their repercussions on people. The view of the international community on the imposition of sanctions was reflected in the consensus arrived at by the Subgroup on sanctions within the framework of the Open-ended Working Group on An Agenda for Peace, which confirmed, among other things, the need to avoid the adverse long- and short-term effects inflicted upon people as a result of sanctions. Sudan holds the Security Council and its members responsible in the eyes of history for the draft resolution they are about to adopt. Logic would indicate that the Sudan's cooperation and serious attempts to comply with the Council resolutions should be met with encouragement by the Council, not by a warning that further sanctions will be imposed on a suppressed and weak people. The measure that the Council intends to take today, although some believe it was simply a means to delay discussion of the subject with a view to granting Sudan more time, is an attempt to prejudge Sudan. The victims will be the peaceful Sudanese people and the region as a whole.

Allow me to pose a legitimate question. Is the international community keen on punishing people by imposing sanctions, or is it using this means to maintain international peace and security and to solve problems? We are faced with a situation in which positive steps are being taken: things are moving forward, not backward. Imposing sanctions in this case reaffirms that the intention is to punish people. Here, I would like to say that the way in which the Council has discussed this subject will be a very bad example for other States seeking justice from the international community, particularly since all Sudan wanted was justice and nothing more. For many States, what Sudan has come to face in the Security Council is simply injustice in its worst form.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that the principles that Sudan has set forth are truth, justice, consultation and peace. That is why the accusations levelled against Sudan run counter, in principle, to the premises on which we base our policies and practices. Sudan will for ever remain true to these principles, in conformity with our heritage and our history as a Member State that effectively participates in the maintenance of international peace and security. As such, Sudan will spare no effort and leave no stone unturned to consecrate these principles and to continue to comply with all the resolutions of the Security Council, because we are fully committed to international legitimacy.

The President: I take it that the representative of Sudan was not aware of the Council's new practice of forgoing compliments addressed to the President and to his predecessor. All the same, I want to thank him for the kind words addressed to my predecessor and to myself.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Sir John Weston (United Kingdom): Despite everything that has just been said by the representative of Sudan, to which I listened carefully, my delegation is unfortunately not persuaded that Sudan has yet complied with the Council's demands in resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996). Sudan has not extradited the three suspects wanted in connection with the assassination attempt on President Mubarak, and many of Sudan's neighbours remain concerned about its support for terrorist activities within their territories.

That is why the Council has to take further action. It has nothing to do with the orientation of the current Government in Sudan: it is purely and simply a necessary response to Sudan's failure to respond adequately to the demands of this Council and of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

We therefore welcome the initiative of Egypt in bringing forward the draft resolution on which we are about to vote. We fully support the measures it contains, and we hope that they will contribute to an early change of heart in Khartoum.

The solution to the problem is simple: the Government of Sudan must recognize international concern about its behaviour and comply with the demands of the Security Council and the OAU.

One of the principal demands of this draft resolution and the previous resolutions is the requirement for Sudan to ensure that the three suspects wanted in connection with the assassination attempt on President Mubarak are brought to justice in Ethiopia. We remain convinced that the Government of Sudan knows where they are. If they are still in Sudan, the answer is straightforward: the Government must extradite them to Ethiopia under the terms of the bilateral extradition treaty. If, as may be the case, Sudan has helped at least one of the three to leave the country, this draft resolution clearly requires that the Government of Sudan must take immediate action, including, for example, by providing the necessary evidence, to bring about extradition to Ethiopia. We will not be satisfied until Sudan has secured this objective, and has also ceased to support international terrorism.

We have noted with interest the moves Sudan has made to distance itself from some of the terrorist groups it has supported, and we have noted the claims made by the Government of Sudan that it has demonstrated its readiness to cooperate with all parties concerned in seeking and apprehending the suspects. But we consider that it still needs to do more to comply with the demands of Security Council resolution 1044 (1996).

By adopting this draft resolution the Security Council will show the Government of Sudan that it remains engaged in this matter, and that it will not hesitate to implement air sanctions after a period of 90 days if Sudanese compliance is not forthcoming.

Finally, we urge those States that have not yet reported to the Secretary-General on the steps they have taken to implement resolution 1054 (1996) to do so. Rigorous enforcement of sanctions is an important factor in ensuring Sudanese compliance.

Mr. Gnehm (United States of America): The international community has demanded two simple steps of Sudan: the surrender of the three remaining suspects responsible for plotting the terrorist attack on Egyptian President Mubarak and, secondly, the end of its support for terrorism.

The Government of Sudan so far has refused to comply with these straightforward requirements. The Secretary-General's latest report makes that fact quite plain.

What we have witnessed instead, and what we have heard today, is a phony Sudanese public relations campaign to try to convince the world that Sudan has cooperated in the security field. As adoption of this draft resolution will make clear, the international community is neither confused nor distracted by such tactical ploys. Instead, it is prepared to apply measured, incremental pressure on the Government of Sudan until it meets fully its obligations. The Council will act today in a manner which carefully avoids aggravating the humanitarian crisis in the Sudan. We will ensure that if Sudan forces us to implement sanctions on its airline, humanitarian relief will continue.

This draft resolution is what I might call a wake-up call to the Sudanese authorities. In 90 days we will meet to decide the entry into force of the sanctions agreed to today and to set up their modalities. Because of the binding nature of today's decision, there can be no question of backtracking if the Sudanese remain obstinate. There must be no confusion on that point.

This grace period has one purpose: to give the Sudanese a chance to abandon their attempt to defy the will of the Security Council and the norms of international decency. There is one way, and one way only, for the Sudanese Government to avoid these sanctions: to take meaningful and convincing steps to cooperate in tracking down the three suspects and to bring an end to Sudanese support for terrorist groups.

International terrorism targets unprotected people, people who want only to live in privacy and peace. All Member States face its threat. World leaders have stressed their commitment to the battle against terrorism time and time again. Today we take a small step forward in that campaign. Our patient approach must not be misread in Khartoum. Our collective commitment to eradicating terrorism is unflagging. Continued Sudanese non-compliance with the demands of the international community not only will bring these measures into force, but will compel consideration of further steps.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: Russia has always taken the position of resolutely resisting international terrorism in all its manifestations. In combating this extremely dangerous threat to world peace and security, we cooperate with various States in a concrete and constructive manner, as well as with international and regional organizations. Russia's contribution in preparing the anti-terrorist decisions of the Group of 8, adopted in Lyons and Paris, is clear proof of our consistent policy in this regard.

Russia decisively condemned the attempted assassination of the President of Egypt in Addis Ababa. We are making persistent efforts to see to it that an objective investigation into this crime, on the basis of facts, is carried out and that its perpetrators are brought to justice.

This job can be accomplished only through constructive cooperation between all interested parties, including within the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and other regional mechanisms, as well as at the bilateral level, with the involvement, if necessary, of competent international agencies. In particular, we are familiar with the pertinent proposals made by Interpol, but unfortunately, so far they have been left floating in the air. Important additional information might come to light also during the *in camera* trial going on in Addis Ababa, and we repeat our request for members of the Security Council to be informed about this trial.

We cannot fail to be concerned by the fact that when resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996) were adopted, the prevailing approach in the Security Council was aimed not so much at investigating those suspected of perpetrating a terrorist act as at isolating Sudan. In order to satisfy short-term interests, the voices were ignored of those — including my delegation — who strongly objected to the unsound practice of imposing sanctions on the basis of vague, and therefore hard-to-meet demands, without clearly formulated criteria and conditions for their imposition and lifting.

Unfortunately, a repetition of this approach can be seen in this draft resolution. It is true that this time the sponsors sensibly gave up the idea of an automatic imposition of a partial air embargo against Sudan; that was a step in the right direction. However, the draft resolution predetermines the inevitability of an air embargo. We are surprised that this was decided without an attempt being made to assess the negative humanitarian consequences of this measure for the population of Sudan, despite the fact that our delegation suggested that such a prior evaluation be conducted. Moreover, paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would impose sanctions not only on Sudan Airways but on all other Sudanese airlines, which have never been accused of anything.

The question arises of how Sudan should comply with the provisions of resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996), as, in several aspects, these provisions go beyond the limits of Sudan's national jurisdiction and real capacity.

The rash use of the sanctions instrument is not only destructive for the people of Sudan and the countries of the region, but creates a precedent which could do real damage to the Security Council's authority by giving the impression that the Council is not able to draw conclusions from past lessons. A paradoxical situation arises: on the one hand, during various informal consultations and in discussion in bodies of the General Assembly, broad support is given to the need to take into account and minimize the negative consequences of sanctions, *inter alia* for third countries, and the need to

establish clear criteria and time- limits; on the other hand, when it comes to taking specific decisions in concrete situations, the old approaches are followed.

In this light, the Russian delegation cannot support the draft resolution. However, we deem it possible not to stand in the way of its adoption. We trust that if, after three months, it falls to the Security Council to consider again the question of Sudan, common sense will prevail, and a commitment will be made to the goal of a realistic campaign against terrorism, not an attempt to use this slogan to punish regimes that some find unpalatable. We believe that such a discussion, if it takes place in three months' time, should be conducted only on the basis of an appropriate report of the Secretary-General, which should reflect both the possible humanitarian consequences of the measures being considered by the Security Council and an analysis of specific ways to resolve the issue, taking into account the proposals of Interpol and the progress made in Addis Ababa in the *in camera* trial.

We are convinced that the problem of bringing the suspects to justice must and can be urgently resolved. We hope that the Government of Sudan, in the spirit of its well-known proposals and promises, will, in cooperation with the authorities of Ethiopia, Egypt and other interested States, take real steps to attain that goal.

Mr. Wisnumurti (Indonesia): Let me begin by expressing the Indonesian delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report, contained in document S/1996/541 of 10 July 1996 and its addenda, concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 1054 (1996). We consider that the report reflects a balanced and objective view, since it takes into account not only the measures taken by Member States but also the initiatives taken by the Sudanese Government in its efforts to comply with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

We, like others, are deeply concerned by the assassination attempt against President Hosni Mubarak of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Addis Ababa in June 1995. Such an act of violence can only be decried in the strongest terms, and the perpetrators must be brought to justice. Indeed, the Indonesian delegation has always held a steadfast position against international terrorism, as that constitutes one of the most flagrant violations of human rights. In this regard, the Indonesian delegation wishes to reiterate its view that the Sudan bears the ultimate responsibility for fully complying with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996) by apprehending the perpetrators of this act of violence, as well as by refraining from providing support or shelter to terrorists on its territory. We are therefore encouraged to note that this aspect has already been incorporated into paragraph 1 of the draft resolution before us.

Notwithstanding this, the Indonesian delegation has believed, from the beginning, that a gradual approach to dealing with the matter would have been preferable, particularly in the light of the efforts made by the Sudan. As reflected in the letters of 31 May 1996 and 24 June 1996, the Sudanese Government has made efforts to find two of the three suspects and has also called upon Interpol for assistance. It has also stated its condemnation of terrorism and has taken the necessary steps to ensure that it is not perpetrated from its territory. Moreover, the Sudanese Government has made efforts to extradite many possible perpetrators of terrorism. These efforts follow the spirit of paragraph 1 (b) of resolution 1054 (1996). We also note that Sudan's letter of 2 July 1996 states that efforts are being made to enhance bilateral relations between Egypt and the Sudan as part of its intention to improve relations with its neighbouring countries.

However, on the assumption that the three suspects are no longer in the country, the Sudan would not be in a position to comply fully with the provisions of the relevant resolutions. Given the insufficient information available at this juncture, we believe that it would be more constructive for the Council to further encourage the Sudan to undertake efforts to provide information on the suspects, including their whereabouts, by allowing more time and avoiding overly harsh measures that in the end may prove to be counterproductive in their attempt to ensure the Sudan's cooperation with the international community. We therefore cannot but express our reservations regarding the imposition of wide-ranging sanctions against Sudan Airways, as reflected in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Although the ban on Sudan Airways is primarily targeted at its international flights, we are none the less concerned that it would also have an impact on its domestic activities, particularly the transport of humanitarian needs, since these two aspects are closely interlinked.

While fully realizing that, under paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, implementation of these measures and consideration of all the aspects of the modalities of implementation would not be determined by the Council until 90 days after the date of adoption of the draft resolution on the basis of the facts established by the Secretary-General, we feel that the timing of incorporating such measures in the draft is not

appropriate. Moreover, our understanding regarding these modalities would also include a fixed duration for the imposition of such sanctions.

The Indonesian delegation is concerned about the extent of the impact of sanctions on the Sudan, since it is one of the poorest countries in the world. Their imposition would have detrimental effects on the innocent civilian population and impact negatively on the economy. We would like to reiterate that, as a matter of principle, the imposition of sanctions as a means of bringing pressure to bear on Governments is a matter of utmost seriousness. Sanctions are not meant to be punitive. Therefore, the adverse humanitarian impact, in particular in the case of the Sudan, must not be so quickly dismissed.

In this regard, it is my view that in order for a resolution to achieve its desired effects and to become an effective tool to rectify a situation, it is imperative to address not only the concerns of the issue at hand, but also to maintain strict adherence to the basic principle of non-punitive sanctions. For it would be a meaningless exercise if resolutions were adopted which were not implementable, as this would only affect the Council's own credibility. If fundamental principles are not respected, however good intentions may be, a resolution may not adequately address the matter.

The draft resolution before us today essentially addresses the continued non-compliance by the Sudanese Government with the requests set out in paragraph 4 of resolution 1044 (1996) and reaffirmed in paragraph 1 of resolution 1054 (1996). Considering that the basic tenets remain that those responsible for the assassination attempt must be brought to justice and that the Sudan has the responsibility to comply with the relevant Security Council resolutions, and in the light of the observations I have just expressed, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Park (Republic of Korea): More than seven months have passed since the Security Council first acted upon the issue at hand by adopting resolution 1044 (1996), calling upon the Government of Sudan, *inter alia*, to comply with the requests of the Organization of African Unity to extradite the three suspects wanted in connection with the assassination attempt on the life of President Mubarak of Egypt and to desist from supporting terrorist activities. Nearly four months ago the Council acted under Chapter VII of the Charter to reiterate its demands by adopting resolution 1054 (1996).

My delegation regrets the lack of progress in the implementation of paragraph 1 of Security Council resolution 1054 (1996). We believe that the Sudanese Government can and should meet the demands of the Security Council. When it comes to paragraph 1 (b) of resolution 1054 (1996), we note that some positive steps have been taken by the Government of Sudan. We welcome the Sudanese Government's condemnation of terrorism and its commitment to ensure that no terrorist activities are tolerated in Sudanese territory. We believe that Sudan's declared commitments should be backed up by further concrete actions.

We believe that the purpose of the draft resolution before us is to send a clear message to Sudan that there is no substitute for compliance with the Council's demands. It contains no forceful measures to be implemented immediately. However, the measures specified in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution to be adopted represent a clear warning of what could follow if, and only if, the Government of Sudan fails to comply with the demands reiterated in paragraph 1 within 90 days. The central merit of this phased approach is that Sudan's compliance within the next 90 days obviates altogether the need to actually implement paragraph 3. We appeal to Sudan to make the best use of the additional grace period allowed under the draft resolution to comply fully and promptly with the demands of the Security Council.

With these remarks, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Council.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China)*(interpretation from Chinese)*: During the deliberations on the present item in the Security Council, the Chinese delegation has reaffirmed on many occasions that it has consistently and resolutely been opposed to any form of terrorist activities.

In our view, all terrorists should be brought to justice. The attempt on the life of President Mubarak of Egypt constitutes a serious incident. All sides concerned should join in a common effort to apprehend the suspects for prosecution. Ever since the Council adopted Security Council resolution 1054 (1996), all sides concerned have made considerable efforts to implement its relevant provisions. In his report, the Secretary-General also pointed out that as a party directly concerned, the Sudan has on many occasions indicated in specific terms its opposition to terrorism and has taken some practical actions. In our view, the Council should continue to

encourage all sides to make greater efforts in order to settle the question as soon as possible.

China's position of principle on sanctions is a consistent one. We do not consider sanctions a panacea because sanctions, or the tightening of sanctions, cannot solve a problem; they may, on the contrary, further aggravate the problem. Restrictions on Sudan Airways constitute an escalation in the sanctions regime on the Sudan.

Although the draft resolution before us does not determine the date of entry into force of its provisions, it represents a clear decision on imposing such sanctions. This question concerning the Sudan is already quite complicated. We are concerned that tightening sanctions against the Sudan might further compound the problem. The Chinese delegation proposed some amendments to the draft resolution during consultations. These reasonable suggestions have regrettably not found acceptance. Therefore, we cannot but abstain in the vote on the draft resolution before us.

We believe that as long as the parties concerned pursue the path of dialogue and consultations in good faith and with seriousness of purpose, a satisfactory solution can ultimately be found to all problems. We earnestly hope that this will happen.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): The draft resolution before us was prepared and introduced by the three African countries sitting on the Security Council. The Italian delegation has great respect for the positions of the African members of the Council, and from the very beginning their Governments have worked on the case we are examining within the framework of the Organization of African Unity.

This draft resolution meets, in our opinion, the Security Council's purpose: to make known to the Government of Khartoum the further measures the Security Council is prepared to take. It is our hope that Sudan will be able to comply with the pertinent resolution, thereby avoiding a dangerous isolation of its country from the international community.

The letter sent by the Sudanese Government to the Secretary-General and the clear condemnation of terrorism and the commitment to cooperate in the investigation that we have just heard from the Permanent Representative of Sudan indicate that that Government is aware of the need to do something about the international community's perception of Sudan as a provider of support and shelter to international terrorist organizations.

However, the initiatives undertaken so far by the Government of Khartoum appear to fall short of full compliance with the demands of the Security Council, in particular, with the ones concerning the finding and extradition to Ethiopia of the suspects wanted in connection with the assassination attempt on the life of President Mubarak of Egypt, which took place in Addis Ababa on 26 June 1995.

My country's relations with this region of Africa are very old and, traditionally, intense. Italy therefore wishes that genuine peace may soon return to the region, and that is why we have always been at the forefront of providing and coordinating humanitarian assistance to the people of Sudan. At the same time, I think that we must reaffirm strongly that an end to acts of international terrorism is essential for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is the reason why Italy will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Nkgowe (Botswana): During the meeting at which resolution 1054 (1996) was adopted, on 26 April 1996, my delegation expressed the hope and the belief that the Government of the Sudan would comply fully with the demands of resolution 1044 (1996). We expressed confidence in the ability of the Sudan to avoid an escalation of the situation by facilitating the handover of the three suspects to Ethiopia for prosecution.

Let me reiterate once again that, as an African country, Botswana harbours no ill feelings or intentions towards the brotherly people of the Sudan. Reason, however, dictates that the suspects who made an attempt on the life of President Mubarak of Egypt must be brought to justice in accordance with the demands of resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996). We trust that this time our brothers in the Sudan will fully comply with those resolutions and thus avoid a situation in which the Security Council might be pushed into taking certain actions to ensure compliance with its resolutions. The draft resolution before the Council specifies possible measures that may be imposed against the Sudan in case of continued lack of compliance with prior resolutions. It definitely gives the Sudan ample time to implement the resolutions of the Council. It would be most unfortunate indeed if at the end of the 90-day grace period the Council were to find itself with no option but to impose the measures foreseen in the present draft resolution.

I wish to conclude by once again imploring the Government of Sudan to comply fully with the demands of resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996). We hope the Government of the Sudan will respond positively to the demands of those resolutions and that the draft resolution on which we are about to vote will be the last to be adopted by the Council on this question.

Mr. Lopes Cabral (Guinea-Bissau) (*interpretation from French*): Very soon — only hours — after the attempt to assassinate President Mubarak, Guinea-Bissau condemned that act of terrorism. We consider that any State offering passage, logistics or shelter to terrorists has explicitly established its own complicity and thus bears international responsibility.

As noted, my country has sponsored the draft resolution before the Council. It did so not out of automatic African solidarity but because of a position based on clear principles. The Government of Guinea-Bissau is opposed to terrorism and will spare no effort in attacking terrorism in all its forms. This does not mean that we are about to make a general statement on this matter, as we had an opportunity, when resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996) were adopted, to discuss the question at length and clearly to state our position.

However, as we are about to vote on this very important draft resolution, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity on behalf of my Government to reaffirm our firm determination to contribute to the struggle against international terrorism in all its forms. Today's draft resolution is not aimed at the people of Sudan. As its provisions indicate, it is intended to inform the Government of Sudan that it must take the decision to bring to justice the individuals implicated in this act of terrorism. In our view, it is important that the Khartoum Government comply with the draft resolution within 90 days so that we are not forced once again to cite it for lack of respect for or non-compliance with decisions of the Security Council, which would oblige us to take measures that could be injurious to the people of Sudan.

We hope that in the coming 90 days the Government of Sudan and the Security Council will be able to affirm that the provisions of the draft resolution have been observed and that we are in a position to bring to justice the individuals implicated in the attack.

The President: I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/1996/664.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Botswana, Chile, Egypt, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Poland, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China, Russian Federation

The President: The result of the voting is as follows: 13 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstaining. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 1070 (1996).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is almost four months since the Security Council adopted resolution 1054 (1996), in which it reaffirmed its demand that the Sudanese Government comply with two clear, specific demands earlier set out in two resolutions of the Organization of African Unity, which had taken the view that this matter posed a threat to the security of the African continent.

The first demand was the extradition to Ethiopia of the three suspects sheltered in Sudan and wanted in connection with the criminal assassination attempt on the life of the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Addis Ababa. The second demand was that Sudan desist from supporting terrorist activities and from giving shelter to terrorist elements.

Since the adoption of that resolution in April, and despite the fact that it imposed limited diplomatic measures to compel Sudan to comply with the demands of the international community, we note that Sudan has persisted in its attempts to avoid complying with the Security Council's requests, as is clear from the July report of the Secretary-General.

We in Egypt had hoped that the Sudanese regime would fully understand the clear message of resolution 1054 (1996), namely, that the Council will never tolerate the conduct of any Government anywhere in support of

international terrorism or in providing on its territory any shelter or sanctuary for traitors who have sold out their countries, consciences and religion and who are determined to use terrorism as a means to their ends.

This hope was reinforced when President Hosni Mubarak met with his Sudanese counterpart, President Omer Al-Bashir, in Cairo at the Arab summit. At the time Egypt thought that Sudan had the political will expected of it by the international community. At that time Egypt accepted Sudan's request to open a channel of communications between the countries' security authorities to discuss the subjects that represent real problems in this respect.

Unfortunately, Egypt hopes were dashed when we realized that Sudan's aim was not to enter into a dialogue, but rather to try to take advantage of Egypt's assent to starting that dialogue to give the false impression to the international community that it was doing what was expected of it.

Egypt thinks that the resolution just adopted by the Council and sponsored by the African countries of the Council, resolution 1070 (1996), is a mere wake-up call addressed to Sudan. It says that Sudan must cooperate with the Council and with the concerned countries — especially Egypt and Ethiopia — in order to comply with the requests of the Council contained in previous resolutions and reaffirmed in today's resolution.

It is extremely difficult for Egypt to return to the Security Council because of Sudan's refusal to cooperate in the implementation of the resolutions of the Council. What the international community has announced is that it must combat international terrorism by all means. No one fully knows how deep and friendly are the relations that link the Egyptian people with the Sudanese people: their ties are as old as the Nile, are enhanced by geographical proximity, neighbourly relations, a common language, the similarity of their social customs and the human relations between the two peoples in the Nile valley since time immemorial. Moreover, we in Egypt consider that the common destiny of Egypt and Sudan is a fact. That is something we have felt since the dawn of history.

On this basis, I would like to repeat here very clearly what I said on behalf of my Government throughout the consultations: Egypt finds it unacceptable to be behind anything that affects the interests of the Sudanese people, adds to its economic suffering in its daily life or harms its territorial integrity.

On the other hand, our brothers in Sudan should understand that the resolutions of the Security Council should be respected and implemented. That is why we call on the Sudanese Government to take advantage of the grace period given it by the Council, until the middle of November 1996, to translate sweet talk into proper action. The old Arab verse that the representative of Sudan quoted, describes, as a matter of fact, the feelings of the Egyptian people, because the Egyptian people never expected the infiltration of terrorism from brotherly Sudan.

Egypt — whose people feel real bitterness — hopes that the coming period will witness positive developments from Sudan, in terms of the extradition of the suspects, the provision of any information Sudan has about them and the severance of all relations — I repeat, all relations — with terrorist organizations so that the interests of the brotherly people of Sudan will not suffer.

Allow me to conclude today, as I concluded my statement last April by saying that every Egyptian understands and feels the special nature of the age-old historical relations in the Nile valley that link the two peoples of Egypt and Sudan. We in Egypt consider our country a natural extension of Sudan and Sudan an extension of Egypt. Whatever touches the people of Sudan touches the people of Egypt, and vice versa. Egypt is very eager for the Sudanese Government to turn on to the right path so that the Sudanese people will enjoy prosperity and good relations with all their neighbours, especially with us in Egypt. We are confident that the deep-going ties that link our peoples in the north and south of the Nile valley, and which have been enhanced during the course of history, will, God willing, for ever continue to grow stronger, like the waters of the Nile, the life-line of Sudan and Egypt.

Mr. Ladsous (France) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has been considering the question of Sudan since the beginning of the year. It took up the question following serious events that endangered the life of the Egyptian President. It was following the attempted assassination of Mr. Mubarak that the Council requested, in resolution 1044 (1996) of 31 January 1996, that Sudan extradite the three suspects and renounce terrorism.

Thus far, Sudan has not fully satisfied these two basic points. The Council emphasized this once again when it adopted a second resolution on 26 April 1996, resolution 1054 (1996), to prevail upon the Sudanese authorities to meet their obligations.

We must say today that that second warning by the Council has not been completely heeded. It is true that the Khartoum Government has made some efforts to implement the two Council resolutions, but we believe that the efforts made to date are inadequate.

It therefore seems timely to us for the Council to step up its pressure on the Sudanese authorities so that they will fully discharge their obligations under resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996).

That is why the Council has just adopted a resolution containing a decision to impose air sanctions against Sudan. The text also provides that the date of entry into force of those sanctions, as well as the modalities of their implementation, will be the subject of discussions to take place within 90 days.

The Government of France intends to see to it that these new sanctions are understood not as a punishment but as an incentive. That is why the Council must think about how they should be applied, and in particular about their duration. In our view, these measures should not penalize the people of Sudan by making them suffer additional restrictions that could have serious humanitarian consequences.

In any event, these measures will not enter into force yet. And we hope that the Sudanese authorities will take advantage of the three-month period granted them to bring themselves into compliance with resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996).

The sanctions against Sudan are not inevitable. It is up to the Government of Sudan to demonstrate that they may, indeed, be avoided.

Mr. Matuszewski (Poland): The Polish delegation stated its position on the issue before us on 31 January 1996 and on 26 April 1996.

My country condemns terrorism in all its forms. Having examined very carefully the report of the Secretary-General of 10 July 1996, as well as other relevant documents, we have to concur with the conclusion that the Government of Sudan has failed to comply with the demands contained in resolutions 1044 (1996) and 1054 (1996).

We therefore urge that Government to take immediate and effective steps to fulfil its obligations, including measures which would ensure that the persons suspected of committing an attempt on the life of President Mubarak of Egypt are brought to justice, as stipulated in this Council's resolutions and in the documents of the Organization of African Unity.

The resolution the Security Council has just adopted confirms that the international community expects the Government of Sudan to fully comply with the demands of this Council and of the Organization of African Unity. It is also evidence of this Council's determination in pursuing all possible options to influence the behaviour of those who endanger international peace and security by supporting terrorism. By postponing the decision on the actual entry into force of sanctions, the resolution provides the Government of Sudan with a chance to take the necessary action. We sincerely hope that this chance is not to be lost.

With this in mind, the Polish delegation voted in favour of the resolution.

Mr. Espinosa (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With its vote in favour, my delegation contributed to the adoption of the resolution introduced by three African States that are members of the Security Council. From the beginning, we expressed our alarm at and condemnation of the treacherous assassination attempt against President Mubarak of Egypt. With this resolution, the Council sends a clear signal that Sudan must respond to the requests contained in paragraph 4 of resolution 1044 (1996) and reaffirmed in resolution 1054 (1996). Like France, we view these provisions as incentives and not as punishment. We believe the resolution provides a reasonable grace period for the adoption of the measures necessary to meet the requirements of the Council in this matter.

This is not a resolution of immediate effect. In due course, when the time limit provided for in operative paragraph 4 has elapsed, we will have an opportunity to properly assess the situation and its developments. We express our hope that this assessment will make it unnecessary for us to take further measures. To this end, we will be paying attention to everything that occurs, to all information the Secretary-General can provide us and to information from any other relevant source. And if, regrettably, it turns out that measures have to be adopted, we will see to it that in their application account is taken of their possible humanitarian implications *inter alia*. Should sanctions have to be implemented, we are interested in ensuring that they do not bring harm to the Sudanese people. In the view of my country, to the extent

possible we must avoid creating innocent victims in the fight against terrorism.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Germany.

The subject we are talking about today is terrorism. Once again we are dealing with the very serious matter of the attempted assassination of the President of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak, on 26 June of last year.

My Government's position on terrorism has been pointed out clearly: we will not give in to terrorism; we have to fight it. Those who have committed terrorist acts have to be brought to justice. Those who have supported terrorists have to bear the consequences.

On several occasions the Council has discussed this matter and urged the Government of Sudan to comply with the requests of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Twice the Security Council has adopted resolutions asking for the extradition of the suspects and calling upon the Sudanese Government to desist from any kind of support for terrorist activities.

The decision on further sanctions is not an easy one. As we stated earlier, the purpose of sanctions should not be punishment. The sanctions are aiming at those who are in a position to take the required measures. The sanctions should not bring unnecessary suffering to the civilian population.

Sudan is given another 90 days to comply with these resolutions. Now it is up to Sudan to show that its words are followed by deeds. We call upon the Sudanese Government to give clear evidence of its cooperation and to do its utmost to bring about the extradition of the suspects and to provide the international community with all the information necessary so that the suspects can be prosecuted in Ethiopia.

On the basis of these considerations, Germany voted in favour of the adoption of this resolution.

There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.